

**Digital On-Premises Sign Ordinance
Stakeholder Committee Meeting**

**Cliff Morton Development and Business Services Center
1901 S. Alamo
Training Room A**

Thursday, February 11, 2010

Meeting Notes

Committee Members:

Teri Bilby
Greg Burkett
Bill Bourne
Larry Gottsman
Barbara Hall
Darrell Keller
Robyn Locke
Paul Rohlfs
Chuck Saxer
Pete Sitterle
Lydell Toye

Attendees:

Adam Greenup
Ruben Lizalde

Technical Advisor:

Joel Heine

1. Introductions

2. Review of Project Status: Presentation by Andrew Spurgin *(please see website*

<http://www.sanantonio.gov/dsd/digitalsigns.asp>)

3. Committee Discussion on Amendment Comments

- Committee agreed to staff's proposal definition of digital sign display.
- Brightness: One committee member suggested the ordinance should address dimmer control and glare. The ordinance will use the same language as in the MLOD ordinance, i.e. requiring light cut-off devices. The distance for measuring a digital display depends on the size of the display. The committee's technical advisor provided recommended measurement distances *(see Distance Criteria handout from Daktronics)*.
- Displays: Staff would like to see a minimum dwell time of 8 to 10 seconds. Committee members mentioned on-premise signs are used for point-of-sale advertising. Suggestion made by a committee member to base dwell time on size of sign. Suggestion made by the technical advisor to limit scrolling, blinking, and flashing. Committee suggested that by lowering the brightness of signs, there is less need for minimum dwell times. Committee member suggested returning to dwell times after the regulation on brightness is in place. Committee member mentioned basing dwell time and animation on location and/or type, which would be determined by special exceptions. There was objection raised to the special exception concept due to fees and the process.

- Animation: Committee members discussed the need for a definition of animation. Several committee members mentioned animation is meant to draw attention, such as a waving flag, while full motion video is like running commercials and is usually not displayed on digital signs. Animation could mean graphic motion created by a computer. Committee agreed to prohibit sound, scrolling, and flashing with clarification that the intent of prohibiting scrolling is to regulate line travel text such as “ticker tape.”
- Location and placement relative to residential: Committee member mentioned the placement of signs near residential streets is the problem. Committee proposed a new alternative to staff’s language based on a lower footcandle reading taken from residential property. Staff made an analogy to this performance standard with the noise ordinance which is based on certain decibel readings of the noise source measured at the residential property.
- Location and placement within lot: Committee agreed with staff’s proposed language.
- Sign Failure: Committee agreed with staff’s proposed language.
- Sign Dimensions: Committee agreed with staff’s proposed language.
- Digital Conversions: Committee wants to know if a replacement of a face to digital is considered a reface. Staff suggested that digital conversions could be a separate process. Several committee members indicated that a separate process for digital conversions is unnecessary due the existing nonconforming rights and reface provisions. Committee member added that the sign referenced in the note section is actually a billboard and should not be included.

Next Steps

- Staff will revise “On-Premises Digital Sign Display Concepts”
- Staff will post the results of sign tour on its website
- The committee agreed to meet next on March 5, 2010 at 9 a.m.
- The committee agreed to a public meeting on March 22, 2010 at 6 p.m.